<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-16 remain in this application, of which Claims 1, 7 and 11-16 are in independent form. The abstract has been amended as to matters of form. No changes have been made to any of the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0123072 (Spronk). After a careful study of the prior art and the outstanding rejection, however, Applicant strongly believes that the claims are allowable, for at least the following reasons.

In color printing, it is common for a user to perform a color-matching process before printing, to try to ensure that the printer output will have the desired appearance. This is because different devices may have different color spaces (i.e., different sets of colors that they are capable of handling), and the color space of the device that created the image data to be output may differ significantly from that of the device to be used for the outputting of the image. The present invention is intended to permit this to be done in an instance in which the user is sending the print job to a remote printer.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to an image processing apparatus for performing print simulation through a computer network. The apparatus comprises a device selector, arranged to select a color printer on the network as a print simulation target, and to select another color printer on the network which is used to output a simulation result of the target printer. A profile selector is arranged to select a profile required for a color matching process of the print simulation through the network, and to set the selected profile in the target printer. A communication section transmits image data which is to perform a color matching process to the target printer, and receives the image

data that has performed the color matching process according to the selected profile from the target printer, and an output section causes the simulation output printer to output an image based on the received image data.

Among other notable features of an apparatus constructed according to Claim 1 are the communication and output sections. Applicant submits that, at the least, these features of Claim 1 are not disclosed in, or in any way suggested by, *Spronk*. That document relates to a system for using a color printer to output a color image before beginning production of the image using a printing press. In the *Spronk* system, a color management unit 16 and color printer 18 (see Fig. 1) are used to make a color print of the image to permit confirmation that the output will have the correct appearance ([paragraph [0049]). The image data of the image may be supplied to the color management unit 16 in the form of PDL. This image data is processed using a printer identification profile and a press ID profile, which are intended to capture the relationships between driver signals and device-independent color space colors existing in the printer and the press, respectively.

Applicant respectfully points out that the communication section of an apparatus according to Claim 1 transmits image data, which is to perform a color matching process, to a target printer, and receives the image data that has performed the color matching process according to a selected profile, back from the target printer, and the output section prints the received image data using a simulation output printer which is different from the target printer. The Office Action cites paragraphs [0047], [0049] and [0051] of *Spronk* as disclosing those units. Applicant finds no such disclosure of either section, in any of those paragraphs (or elsewhere in *Spronk*). Paragraph [0047] merely describes that a workstation 36 receives image data from an image scanner 38, and displays

the image data. Paragraph [0049] merely teaches that color management unit 16 executes a color proof using a color printer 18 instead of the printing press 22, and paragraph [0051] merely teaches that color management unit 16 controls color rendering between a printing press 22 and a color printer, and performs color management using device ID profiles.

As Applicant understands the rejection, the Examiner considers that the workstation 36 or color management unit 16 corresponds to the image processing apparatus of Claim 1, the printing press 22 corresponds to the target printer, and the color printer 18 corresponds to the simulation output printer. On this reading, then for *Spronk* to meet the terms of Claim 1 it would be necessary for the workstation 36 or color management unit 16 to transmit image data to the printing press 22, to receive the image data on which the color matching process is performed, from the printing press 22, and to print the received image data using the color printer 18. However, *Spronk* fails to teach any such flow of image data. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is allowable over *Spronk* for at least these reasons.

Independent Claim 7 is directed to an image processing apparatus for performing print simulation through a computer network, which comprises a device selector, arranged to select a color printer on the network as a print simulation target, and to select another color printer on the network which is used to output a simulation result of the target printer, and a profile selector, arranged to select a profile required for a color matching process of the print simulation through the network, and to designate a server of a site where the target printer is present to use the selected profile. A communication section transmits image data which is to perform a color matching process to the server, and receives the image data that has performed the color matching process according to the

- 6 -

selected profile from the server, and an output section makes the simulation output printer output an image based on the received image data.

Applicant submits that nothing has been found in *Spronk* that discloses a profile selector, as recited in Claim 7. The profile selector selects a profile required for the color matching process of the print simulation through a computer network and designate a server of a site where the target printer is present to use the selected profile. While the Office Action cites paragraph [0017] of *Spronk* as providing such disclosure, Applicant strongly disagrees. As far as Applicant can see, paragraph [0017] merely teaches creation of profiles for the printing press 22 and the color printer 18. Neither paragraph [0017], nor anything else in *Spronk*, teaches anything relating to selection of a profile required for the color matching process of the print simulation through the computer network, or designation of the server of the site where the target printer is present to use such selected profile. Accordingly, Claim 7 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Spronk* for at least these reasons.

Independent Claims 11 and 12 contain recitations similar to those discussed above with regard to Claims 1 and 7, respectively, and Claims 13-16 are method claims corresponding to apparatus Claims 1, 7, 11 and 12, respectively. Accordingly, these six independent claims are also believed to be allowable over *Spronk*, for the reasons set out above.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1536169v1